

Luther and Lyra on the *Song of Solomon*: Were They Singing the Same Tune?

By James G. Kiecker

Research has shown that the roots of Luther's hermeneutical method run deep into the medieval exegetical tradition. One of these roots winds back two centuries, into French soil, to Nicholas of Lyra (ca. 1270–1349).ⁱ The consensus is that Lyra, eschewing a spiritual-mystical interpretation of Scripture, advocated a literal-historical interpretation. However, very little effort has been expended to determine just what Lyra meant by a literal-historical interpretation.ⁱⁱ When this effort is made and the results laid beside Luther's self-styled simplest sense of Scripture, the similarity is striking.

We have chosen to compare Lyra's and Luther's commentaries on the *Song of Solomon*, a book with a rich history of interpretation.ⁱⁱⁱ By its nature it compelled commentators to disclose their methodology, usually arriving at what they termed a spiritual interpretation.^{iv} We should expect, then, that what Lyra meant by a literal interpretation, and Luther by the simplest sense, should become apparent in their respective commentaries. And this, of course, puts us in a position to make some comparisons.

In his *Song* preface of 1539 Luther states as his goal "to get at the simplest sense and the real character of this book."^v As Luther goes on to tell us what he considers "the simplest sense" to be, surface similarities between Luther and Lyra begin to emerge:

I think it is a song in which Solomon honors God with his praises; he gives Him thanks for his divinely established and confirmed kingdom and government; he prays for the preservation and extension of this his kingdom...Solomon...wrote his song about his own kingdom and government...All this will become clear from the text itself too.^{vi}

Luther explicitly says that the *Song* "does not treat a story of an individual...but an entire permanent kingdom."^{vii}

Lest anyone get the wrong idea about the true subject matter of the *Song*, Luther states:

[Solomon] does not sing of these exalted matters in the common words that people ordinarily use, but he illustrates and adorns his theme with lofty and figurative words to such an extent that when the crowd hears them, it supposes that the subject treated is something very different. For this is the custom with kings and princes: they compose and sing amatory ballads which the crowd takes to be songs about a bride or a sweetheart, when *in fact* [emphasis added] they portray the condition of their state and people with their songs...Solomon proceeds in just this fashion in this song of his. He uses magnificent words—words that are worthy of so great a king—in describing his concerns. He makes God the bridegroom and his [i.e., Solomon's] people the bride.^{viii}

A little later Luther calls the *Song* "an encomium of the political order."^{ix}

Lyra also makes God the bridegroom.^x For Lyra, however, the bride is the Church of all ages, embracing the situation of both Testaments.^{xi} For Luther, the bride is the kingdom, or government, or his [Solomon's] people. At first glance "kingdom" and "government" seem removed from "Church." But by "his [Solomon's] people" Luther means "the people of God," those who "possess the Word of God and worship reverently," i.e., the Church.^{xii} Luther was not just thinking of any kingdom and government, but that one which belongs to God. This draws Lyra's and Luther's understanding of "the bride" closer together.

A little later Luther admits the *Song* is an "obscure" book. But

...we shall never agree with those who think that it is a love song about the daughter of Pharaoh beloved by Solomon. Nor does it satisfy us to expound it of the union of God and the synagog, or like the tropologists, of the faithful soul.^{xiii}

Lyra also rejects a “Solomon-daughter of Pharaoh” interpretation and a “God-Jewish” interpretation.^{xiv} Luther’s rejections are not identical, but by no means totally dissimilar either.

Here and there, in Luther’s commentary on the Song, there are interpretations reminiscent of Lyra. For example, in 6:5, “Turn away thy eyes from me,” Luther interprets: “It is not that He spurns her eyes, but in the fashion of a lover, even while He commands her to turn them away, He desires above all that she will not.”^{xv} This compares with Lyra:

[This phrase] is understood oppositely. It is the way of speaking of lovers to express [their] mutual love, as [for example] the groom sometimes says to [his] beloved bride, “Go away, I don’t care about you,” by this gesture meaning that he loves her intensely.^{xvi}

In 6:8, concerning the sixty queens and eighty concubines, Luther writes: “I take the 60 queens to be the wealthier and the 80 concubines the more modest cities which were situated throughout Solomon’s entire kingdom.”^{xvii} Lyra takes the queens to be the synagogues of the cities and the concubines to be the synagogues of the towns.^{xviii}

In 6:11 (Vulgate and Douay) (12—RSV), “My soul troubled me for the chariots of Aminadab,” Luther states: “‘My soul ordained me to be the chariot of a noble people.’ For I take the word ‘Aminadab’ to be a common noun. Moreover, it is a common figure of speech that soul is used for ‘willingness.’”^{xix} Lyra states similarly:

Aminadab here is not a single proper name, but is two names signifying the ruling people, and thus the sense is: My soul, that is, my will, which is thus named frequently in Scripture, in this [sense] that it moves the other powers of the soul to action.^{xx}

In 6:12 (13) Luther notes that “Shulamite” means either “perfect” or “at peace.”^{xxi} This Lyra also notes.^{xxii}

In 8:5 Luther calls the translation from the Hebrew, “There thy mother was corrupted,” “a manifest error.” Rather it should be, “There your mother has borne you or delivered you.”^{xxiii} Lyra, more irenically, makes the same correction.^{xxiv}

In 8:11, 12, “He let out the vineyard to keepers....My own vineyard is before me,” Luther says, “This vineyard is committed to the keepers’ charge, but in such a way that God Himself keeps His eye on it.”^{xxv} Lyra says similarly: “It is not believed that by this ‘letting out [to keepers]’ he would lose the keeping of the Church....I [God] assist in this keeping personally and principally.”^{xxvi}

In 8:13 Luther calls “gardens” a reference to “churches.”^{xxvii} He agrees with Lyra.^{xxviii}

The foregoing may all be considered surface similarities between Luther and Lyra. Whether this means Luther was borrowing directly from Lyra, or whether he was using other sources, or relying on his own originality, we, of course, cannot say. Luther makes no direct reference to Lyra in the Song (as he frequently does elsewhere), and the editors of the American Edition do not suggest any borrowing. Nevertheless, since Luther’s use of Lyra is well known, it is certainly likely that he had a copy of Lyra’s Song *Postilla* at hand.

But aside from such surface similarities, there is a similarity on a much deeper level, that of total methodological approach to the text. In fact, here we may see Lyra and Luther in the closest harmony of all.

To start with, Lyra wrote three prologues to his biblical commentaries, two prologues to his earlier *Postilla litteralis*, and a third prologue to his later *Postilla moralis*, all dealing with his hermeneutical principles.^{xxix} In the third prologue Lyra makes this statement:

Some doctors say that the parabolic sense is the literal sense. This is understood generally speaking because where there is no sense signified by words, the parabolic sense is first. And for this reason generally speaking it [i.e., the parabolic sense] is called the literal sense, because the literal sense is the first when there is no other sense there. And to signify this these doctors say that the parabolic sense is contained under the literal sense. And in this manner of speaking I have called the parabolic sense in many places the literal sense, when writing on the books of Sacred Scripture.^{xxx}

Lyra seems to have applied to the Song this statement, based on Thomas Aquinas.^{xxx} Since the words of the Song are the words of a parable, the words signify no (i.e., no *literal*) sense. Rather, the words signify the parabolic (i.e., spiritual) sense. But when the parabolic sense is the only sense present, the parabolic sense becomes by default the *first* sense present, and that is the literal sense. If Lyra can find to his satisfaction the parabolic sense of the words of the Song, he believes he will actually have—not the parabolic, but—the literal sense of the Song.

Lyra’s logic might also be explained as follows: Normally, words signify things to yield the literal sense, and the thing signified by the thing signified by the word would yield the spiritual sense. But in the case of a parable, says Lyra, the words signify things which yield the spiritual (i.e., parabolic) sense, and then the thing signified by the thing signified by the word yields the literal sense. Lyra makes no attempt at legitimatizing his assumption that the Song is, in fact, a parable.

The above statement, from Lyra’s third prologue, is echoed in the first chapter of his Song commentary:

This whole book proceeds parabolically. However, it is not clearly apparent to which persons the points of the parable ought to be applied according to the literal sense, and this, together with the things previously mentioned, causes difficulties in this book. For if this would be apparent—as in Judges 9 [14], where it says, “And all the trees said to the bramble: Come thou and reign over us,” [in which place] it is manifestly clear following from the text that it is understood about the Sichemites and Abimelech whom they anointed king over themselves—then this book would be easy to explain.^{xxxii}

A bit later, Lyra adds: “And the literal sense is this, not that which is signified through words, but [that] which is first understood through the things signified [through words].”^{xxxiii} It seems that Lyra treats Judges 9 [14] the way he intends to treat the whole Song. The words of Judges 9 [14] are a parable. Therefore the words do not signify the literal sense (because there is no literal sense present), but rather the words signify the spiritual sense (because that is the only sense present). Then the things signified by the things signified by the words do not signify the spiritual sense, but rather the things signified by the things signified by the words signify the literal sense. The trees and the bramble do not signify the Sichemites and Abimelech in a spiritual sense, but in a literal sense.

As with Judges 9 [14], so with the whole Song. “This whole book proceeds parabolically,” says Lyra. The words of the Song do not signify the literal sense. Rather, the words of the Song, because they are a parable, signify the spiritual sense. Then the things signified by the things signified by the words of the Song do not signify the spiritual sense, but rather the things signified by the things signified by the words of the Song signify the literal sense.

Luther’s basic approach is strikingly similar. The Song is not a love song about the daughter of Pharaoh beloved by Solomon, even if that is what the words indicate. The words are “figurative,” and “lofty,” to “illustrate” and “adorn” the theme. *In fact* the words portray the condition of the state or government. The words of the text are not the literal sense, upon which or in which one may base or find spiritual senses. Rather, the words of the text signify nothing, or at best an amatory ballad. It is the things signified by the things signified by the words which signify the literal sense. And when Luther says that the Song is about God and the government, he believes he has found the literal, not the spiritual, sense.

Admittedly, Luther does not use the word “literal.” He does not say he is giving the *literal* sense of the Song. Instead he says he is giving the “*simplest* sense and the real character of this book.” But how much difference is there between what Lyra means by the literal sense (*sensus litteralis*), and what Luther means by the simplest sense (*sensus simplicissimus*)? We are suggesting: Not much.

What Lyra did, it seems, was turn earlier medieval methodology on its head. Instead of saying that the words of the text give the literal sense, and then trying to find the real, spiritual sense behind them, Lyra termed the words of the text a parable, giving the parabolic (i.e., spiritual) sense, and then went in search of the real, true literal sense behind them. And in this, Luther was Lyra’s willing follower.

Lyra’s Song *Postilla* is filled with examples of this sort of logic. In the first chapter we read: “Frequently there is a transition...from the Church to God, and vice versa, as if literally in the same context.”^{xxxiv} Neither the word “Church” nor “God” actually appears literally in the Song. The fact that Lyra says “literally” indicates that the actual words of the Song are taken spiritually, and the things signified by the things signified by the words, i.e., “Church” and “God,” are taken literally.

Another clear example is the following:

For this reason it [i.e., the Song] is called a “parable” from “para” which means “beside” and “bole” which means “thought.” For beside what is signified another word is signified. Therefore in this book the groom seems to be taken as God Himself. The bride indeed is the Church herself.^{xxxv}

The Song, i.e., the words of the Song, are a parable. A parable is part of the spiritual sense. Therefore the words are to be interpreted in a spiritual sense. Therefore the things which are signified by the things signified by the words of the Song become the literal sense. Therefore the task of the exegete is to ascertain the things which are signified by the things signified by the words of the Song. This Lyra attempts to do. “The groom seems to be taken [literally, it would seem, not spiritually] as God Himself.” And Lyra adds, “The bride indeed is [literally, it would seem, not spiritually] the Church herself.”

That the parabolic sense is the literal sense may be indicated by a phrase such as “in the person of,” as in this example from chapter two: “Since the Levites...joined themselves with the Lord and with Moses...for this reason the bride says in the person of them...: *My beloved to me, and I to him.*”^{xxxvi} One gets the impression that the word “bride,” the word which signifies a thing, is incidental to the thing signified by the thing signified by the word, i.e., says Lyra, the Levites. The Levites become the true *littera* of the passage.

To what lengths the exegete may go in ascertaining the things signified by the things signified by the words is illustrated in the following passage, from chapter three:

I will rise, and will go about the city, that is, the desert for forty years, because, though it is not able to be called a city as [commonly] accepted, nevertheless it is called a city on account of the number of people living there. In this [desert-city] there were 600,000 not counting women and children.^{xxxvii}

The spiritual sense is signified by the word in the text, “city,” the word in the parable. However, something is signified by the thing signified by the word “city.” That thing, says Lyra, is “desert.” “Desert,” the thing signified by the thing signified by the word “city,” becomes the thing signified by the word “city,” and thus “desert” becomes the literal sense of the word “city.” Does this seem subjective, not to say farfetched? Lyra doesn’t think so. He defends himself by reminding us that more than 600,000 people lived in this desert, surely enough for a good-sized city.

In chapter five we read:

His throat most sweet, that is, white, smooth, and favored. And because everything aforementioned makes for the favoredness of the youth, for this reason there is added, and he is

all lovely. Now, this parable according to all Hebrew and Latin doctors is understood [to be] about God.^{xxxviii}

The actual word of the text, “youth,” covers the true intention of the text, which according to Lyra and many other interpreters is “God.” But it would seem that one must draw a distinction between Lyra and other interpreters, at least his more distant exegetical predecessors. The difference is that other interpreters in the past would consider “God” the spiritual sense of the text, lying behind “youth,” the literal sense of the text. On the other hand, Lyra would consider “God” the literal sense of the text, lying behind “youth,” the parabolic or spiritual sense. Lyra’s logic, dependent on his more recent exegetical predecessors, particularly Thomas Aquinas, would be: The word of the text is “youth,” (the thing signified by the word). But since the word is a parable, the word by definition gives the spiritual, not the literal sense. Rather, the thing signified by the thing signified by the word, otherwise considered the spiritual sense, now must perforce become the literal sense. That thing, many have agreed, is “God.” The parabolic or spiritual sense has become the literal sense.

Turning to the eighth and last chapter of the Song we hear: “It is said in the person of the groom... *Our sister*, that is, the Church which is called the sister of Christ.”^{xxxix} The word of the text, “our,” signifies the thing, “groom.” The thing signified by the thing signified by the word is “Christ.” Though Lyra does not say so here, we may conclude from everything else he has said elsewhere that he considers “Christ” the literal, not the spiritual, sense of the text. Similarly with “sister.” The word “sister” signifies a thing. The thing signified by the thing signified by the word is “Church.” That is the literal sense of the text.

We noted a moment ago to what lengths Lyra was willing to go in ascertaining the things signified by the things signified by the words: By “desert,” a “city” was literally meant. Luther goes to the same lengths: “Breasts” refer to doctrine.^{xl} “The King has brought me into his chambers” shows “that prayer is heard.”^{xli} The “sun” is “tribulation.”^{xlii} “My Beloved is to me a cluster of balsam in the vineyards of Engadi” becomes “a figurative commendation of the consoling discovery that God loves, cherishes, protects.”^{xliii} Add to this Luther’s basic interpretation, that “God is the bridegroom, and his [Solomon’s] people the bride,”^{xliv} and that “Solomon wrote his song about his own kingdom and government, as the text clearly shows.”^{xlv} Many other examples could be cited.

Do interpretations like the above strike the reader as being similar to what passed for *spiritual* interpretations for many centuries? Quite likely they do. But the point is, for Luther, as for Lyra before him, such interpretations were *not* spiritual, but the *simplest*, i.e., the *literal* sense of the text.

An old tradition, in the form of doggeral punning on the name “Lyra,” links Lyra with Luther: *Nisi Lyra lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset.*^{xlvi} This has been called a *dicton absurde*, which has been disproved.^{xlvii} The evidence suggests, however, that Luther did not only borrow scattered interpretations from Lyra, but also a whole methodology. When one takes the trouble to see what Lyra meant by a literal interpretation of Scripture, and compares this to what Luther meant by the simplest sense of Scripture, their congruity becomes clear. It seems, in fact, that in hermeneutical principles and exegetical methods, the man strumming the lyre, and the Wittenberg nightingale, were singing the same tune.

Endnotes

ⁱ Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), pp 130–3.

ⁱⁱ James George Kiecker, “The Hermeneutical Principles and Exegetical Methods of Nicholas of Lyra, O.F.M. (ca. 1270–1349)” (Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1978).

ⁱⁱⁱ Jean Leclercq, O.S.B., *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, tr. Catharine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), p 106.

^{iv} Bernard of Clairvaux’s sermons on the Song, while “sermons” and not strictly “commentary,” which alters the literary style, are nevertheless typical of the general approach to the biblical text. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, I, tr. Killian Walsch, O.C.S.O., *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux*, vol. 2, Cistercian Fathers Series: Number Four (Spencer, Mass.: Cistercian Publications, 1971).

^v Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press and St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1957f.), hereafter cited as *LW XV*, pp x–xi, 191. See *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar: Herman Bohlaus Nachfolger, 1881f), hereafter cited as *WA XXXI*, pt 2, p 586: *Verum utquam simplicissimus et germanus huius Libri sensus quaeratur...*

^{vi} *LW XV*, p 191.

^{vii} *Ibid.* p 192.

^{viii} *Ibid.* p 193. See *WA XXXI*, pt 2, p 587: *Adhaec canit de his tantis rebus non vulgaribus verbis, quibus vulgo utuntur homines, sed magnificis et figuratis verbis illustrat et exornat res suas....*

^{ix} *LW XV*, p 195.

^x Nicholas of Lyra, *Biblia cum postillis*, 3 vols. (Venice: Franciscus Renner, 1482), vol. 2, p 132 recto, col. a, sec. a: *Igitur in hoc libro sponsus accipi videtur ipse Deus*. Hereafter this source will be cited as *V*. All translations are my own. Biblical citations, when they occur, are from the Douay-Rheims version which is closer to the Vulgate.

^{xi} *...sponsa vero ipsa Ecclesia complectens statum utriusquam Testamenti*. *V*, 2, p 132r, col. a, sec. a.

^{xii} *LW XV*, p 192.

^{xiii} *Ibid.* p 194.

^{xiv} *Quidam enim dixerunt quod hic accipitur sponsus ad litteram ipse Salomon, et sponsa filia Pharaonis uxor eius praedilecta, sed hoc non videtur verum... Hebraei dicunt quod iste liber loquitur parabolice de amore Dei et plebis Iudaicai... Expositores vero Catholici dicunt cointer, quod iste liber loquitur de amore Christi et Ecclesiae....* *V*, 2, p 132r, col. a, sec. a.

^{xv} *LW XV*, p 244.

^{xvi} *Averte oculos tuos a me etc., intelligitur per oppositum, et est modus loquendi amantium ad expressionem amoris mutui, sicut sponsus dicit aliquando sponsae praedilectae: Vade, non curo de te, per hoc gestum insinuans quod diligit eam intime....* *V*, 2, p 136r, col. b, sec. q.

^{xvii} *LW XV*, p 245.

^{xviii} *...igitur per reginas possunt intelligi synagogae civitatum, per concubinas oppidorum....* *V*, 2, p 136r, col. b, sec. y.

^{xix} *LW XV*, p 247.

^{xx} *...Aminadab non est hic unum nomen proprium, sed sunt duo nomina significantia populum principantem, et sic est sensus: Anima mea, id est, voluntas mea quae sic nominatur frequenter in Scriptura, eo quod movet alias animae potentias ad agendum....* *V*, 2, p 134 verso, col. a, sec. i.

^{xxi} *LW XV*, p 248.

^{xxii} *In Hebraeo sic habetur: Revertere revertere Sulamit, et si trabatur ad proprietatem Latinam dicitur Sulamitis, id est, integra vel perfecta....* *V*, 2, p 136v, col. a, sec. 1.

^{xxiii} *LW XV*, p 257.

^{xxiv} *Ibi corrupta est mater tua.... Ibi violata est genitrix tua, repetitio est eiusdem ad maiorem assertionem. In Hebraeo habetur: Ibi parturivit te mater tua, ibiparturivit [sic] te genitrix tua....* *V*, 2, p 137v, col. a, secs. v, x; p 137v, col. b, sec. x.

^{xxv} *LW XV*, p 263.

^{xxvi} *Et ne credatur quod per hanc traditionem dimiserit Ecclesiae custodiam ...; ad eius custodiam praesentialiter et principaliter assisto*. *V*, 2, p 138r, col. a, sec. r.

^{xxvii} *LW XV*, p 263.

^{xxviii} *...in hortis, id est, in ecclesiis....* *V*, 2, p 138r, col. b, sec. t.

^{xxix} J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae, Series Latina*, 221 vols. (Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1878f.), vol. 113, cols. 25–36, hereafter cited as *PL*.

^{xxx} *...aliqui doctores dicunt sensum parabolicum esse litteralem; hoc est intelligendum large loquendo, quia ubi non est sensus per voces significatus, parabolicus est primus; et ideo large loquendo dicitur litteralis, eo quod litteralis est primus quando non est ibi alius, et ad hoc significandum ipsi dicunt parabolicum contineri sub litterali; et hoc modo loquendo ego sensum parabolicum vocavi in pluribus locis litteralem, scribendo super libros sacrae Scripturae. PL*, 113, col. 34. My translation.

^{xxxi} Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2 vols., ed. and tr. Thomas Gilby, C.P. (New York: Doubleday, Image Books, 1969), vol. 1, pt. 1, quest. 1, art. 10, pp 59–61.

^{xxxii} *...iste liber procedit parabolice, nec tamen apparet lucide quibus personis determinatae parabolae secundum sensam litteralem sint applicandae, et hoc cum praedictis difficultatem ingerit in hoc libro. Si enim hoc appareret sicut Iudicum IX, ubi dicitur: Dixerunt autem omnia ligna ad rhamnum, veni et impera super nos, ex littera sequente manifeste patet quod intelligitur de Sichimitis et Abimelech quem unxerunt super se regem, tunc facile esset hunc librum exponere.* *V*, 2, p 132r, col. a, sec. a.

^{xxxiii} *Et est hic sensus litteralis, non ille qui per voces significatur, sed qui per res significates primo intelligitur....* *V*, 2, p 132r, col. a, sec. a.

^{xxxiv} *...frequenter fit transitus...de Ecclesia ad Deum et e converso quisi sub eodem contextu litteralem....* *V*, 2, p 132r, col. b, sec. a.

^{xxxv} *...propter hoc dicitur parabola a para quod est iuxta, et bole quod est sententia, quia iuxta significationem vocum aliud significatur. Igitur in hoc libro sponsus accipi videtur ipse Deus, sponsa vero ipsa Ecclesia complectens stature utriusquam Testamenti....* *V*, 2, p 132r, col. a, sec. a.

^{xxxvi} *...quia Levitae iunxerunt se cum Domino et Moyse...ideo in persona eorum dicit sponsa: x Dilectus meus mihi et ego illi....* *V*, 2, p 133v, col. a, secs. v, x.

^{xxxvii} *Surgam et circuibo civitatem, id est, desertam annis XL, quod licit non possit dici civitas secundum se acceptum tamen dicitur civitas propter multitudinem populi ibi circumeuntis, in qua erant sexcenta milia abseque mulieribus et parvulis.* V, 2, p 133v, col. b, sec. h.

^{xxxviii} *Guttur illius suavissimum, id est, album politum et gratiosum. Et quia omnia praedicta faciunt ad gratiositatem iuvenis, ideo subditur: q Et torus desiderabilis. Haec autem parabola secundum omnes doctores Hebraicos et Latinos intelligitur de Deo....* V, 2, p 135v, col. b, secs. p, q.

^{xxxix} *...dicitur in persona sponsi sibi compatiens: Soror nostra, id est, Ecclesia quae dicitur soror Christi....* V, 2, p 137v, col. b, sec. f.

^{xl} LW XV, p 197.

^{xli} Ibid. p 198.

^{xlii} Ibid. p 203.

^{xliiii} Ibid. p 208.

^{xliv} Ibid. p 193.

^{xlvi} Ibid. p 191.

^{xlv} Literally, "If Lyra had not made music on a lyre, Luther would not have danced." The origin of the phrase, in the form *Si Lyra non lyrasset, nemo doctorum in Bibliam saltasset*, is traced to a Peter of Pflug, *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 1963 ed., vol. 7, p 99. The phrase appears with other variations, eg., *Nisi Lyra lyrasset, torus mundus delyrasset*. See H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae II*, pt. 3 (Innsbruck: n. p., 1906).

^{xlvii} Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952; reprint ed., Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p xvi.